

Applicant continues to assert allowability of non-elected Species (b) shown in Figures 6-8 and non-elected Claim 7 for possible further prosecution in a divisional, continuation or continuation-in-part Application or otherwise.

Applicant does not traverse the Restriction.

No change in inventorship is required by virtue of the Election.

R E M A R K S

Comments of the Examiner have been reviewed carefully along with pertinent sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, legal treatises and relevant decisional law. Favorable action on the elected Species (a) Figures 1-5 and Claim 1-6, 8 will be appreciated.

Applicant does not traverse the Restriction, yet Applicant continues to assert allowability of non-elected Species (b) shown in Figures 6-8 and claimed in non-elected Claim 7 for continued prosecution, if any, in a divisional, continuation, continuation-in-part patent Application or otherwise. No change in inventorship resulted from the Election. It is believed that requirements of 35 USC 1.21 have been satisfied.

Upon allowance of a generic claim, Applicant may request consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the

limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the Election, Applicant will indicate which of them are readable upon the elected Species as called for in MPEP §809.02(a).

Courtesy, cooperation and skill of Primary Examiner Jennifer E. NOVOSAD are acknowledged and appreciated. If anything further is required in this Election, Applicants United States Attorney would appreciate a telephone call hereon. His contact information is set forth below.

Respectfully,



CHARLES E. BAXLEY
Attorney of Record
USPTO Reg 20,149
90 John Street, Third Floor
New York, NY 10038
Tel: (212) 791-7200
Fax: (212) 791-7276
E-Mail:ceb@hartbaxley.com

CEB:lp/14019B